A

DISCOURSE

AGAINST

Tranſubſtantiation.

The Fifth Edition.

LONDON,

Printed for *Brabazon Aylmer*, at the *Three Pigeons* againſt the *Royal Exchange* in *Cornhill*:

And *William Rogers*, at the *Sun*, over againſt St. *Dunſtan's* Church in *Fleetſtreet*. 1687.

Price Three pence.

A DISCOURSE AGAINST Tranſubſtantiation.

CConcerning the *Sacrament* of the *Lord's Supper*, one of the two great poſitive Inſtitutions of the Chriſtian Religion, there are two main Points of difference between *Us* and the Church of *Rome*. *One*, about the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*; in which they think, but are not certain, that they have the Scripture and the words of our Saviour on their ſide: The *other*, about the adminiſtration of this Sacrament to the People in both kinds; in which we are ſure that we have the Scripture and our Saviour's Inſtitution on our ſide; and that ſo plainly, that our Adverſaries themſelves do not deny it.

Of the *firſt* of theſe I ſhall now treat, and endeavour to ſhew againſt the Church of *Rome*, *That in this Sacrament there is no ſubſtantial change made of the Elements of Bread and Wine into the natural Body and Bloud of Chriſt*; that *Body* which was born of the *Virgin Mary*, and ſuffered upon the Croſs; for ſo they explain that hard word *Tranſubſtantiation*.

Before I engage in this Argument, I cannot but obſerve what an unreaſonable task we are put upon, by the bold confidence of our Adverſaries, to diſpute a matter of Senſe; which is one of thoſe things about which *Ariſtotle* hath long ſince pronounc'd there ought to be no diſpute.

It might well ſeem ſtrange if any man ſhould write a Book, to prove that an *Egg* is not an *Elephant*, and that a *Muſket-bullet* is not a *Pike*: It is every whit as hard a caſe, to be put to maintain by a long Diſcourſe, that what we ſee and handle and taſte to be *Bread* is *Bread*, and not the *Body of a man*; and what we ſee and taſte to be *Wine* is *Wine*, and not *Bloud*: And if this evidence may not paſs for ſufficient without any farther proof, I do not ſee why any man, that hath confidence enough to doe ſo, may not deny any thing to be what all the World ſees it is; or affirm any thing to be what all the World ſees it is not; and this without all poſſibility of being farther confuted. So that the buſineſs of *Tranſubſtantiation* is not a controverſie of Scripture againſt Scripture, or of Reaſon againſt Reaſon, but of downright Impudence againſt the plain meaning of Scripture, and all the Senſe and Reaſon of Mankind.

It is a moſt Self-evident Falſehood; and there is no Doctrine or Propoſition in the World that is of it ſelf more evidently true, than *Tranſubſtantiation* is evidently falſe: And yet if it were poſſible to be true, it would be the moſt ill-natur'd and pernicious truth in the World, becauſe it would ſuffer nothing elſe to be true; it is like the *Roman-Catholick* Church, which will needs be the whole Chriſtian Church, and will allow no other Society of Chriſtians to be any part of it: So *Tranſubſtantiation*, if it be true at all, it is all truth; for it cannot be true unleſs our Senſes and the Senſes of all Mankind be deceived about their proper objects; and if this be true and certain, then nothing elſe can be ſo; for if we be not certain of what we ſee, we can be certain of nothing.

And

And yet notwithſtanding all this, there is a Company of men in the World ſo abandon'd and given up by God to the efficacy of deluſion as in good earneſt to believe this groſs and palpable Errour, and to impoſe the belief of it upon the Chriſtian World under no leſs penalties than of temporal death and eternal damnation. And therefore to undeceive, if poſſible, theſe deluded Souls, it will be neceſſary to examine the pretended grounds of ſo falſe a Doctrine, and to lay open the monſtrous abſurdity of it.

And in the handling of this Argument, I ſhall proceed in this plain method.

I. I ſhall conſider the pretended grounds and reaſons of the Church of *Rome* for this Doctrine.

II. I ſhall produce our *Objections* againſt *it*. And if I can ſhew that there is no tolerable ground for it, and that there are invincible Objections againſt it, then every man is not onely in reaſon excuſed from believing this Doctrine, but hath great cauſe to believe the contrary.

FIRST, I will conſider the pretended grounds and reaſons of the Church of *Rome* for this Doctrine. Which muſt be one or more of theſe *five*. Either 1*ſt*. The Authority of Scripture. Or 2*ly*. The perpetual belief of this Doctrine in the Chriſtian Church, as an evidence that they always underſtood and interpreted our Saviour's words, *This is my body*, in this ſenſe. Or 3*ly*. The authority of the preſent Church to make and declare new Articles of Faith. Or 4*ly*. The abſolute neceſſity of ſuch a change as this in the Sacrament to the comfort and benefit of thoſe who receive this Sacrament. Or 5*ly*. To magnify the power of the Prieſt, in being able to work ſo great a Miracle. I.

1*ſt*. They pretend for this Doctrine the Authority of Scripture in thoſe words of our Saviour, *This is my body*. Now to ſhew the inſufficiency of this pretence, I ſhall endeavour to make good theſe *two* things.

1. That there is no neceſſity of underſtanding thoſe words of our Saviour in the ſenſe of *Tranſubſtantiation.*

2. That there is a great deal of reaſon to underſtand them otherwiſe.

Firſt, That there is no neceſſity to underſtand thoſe words of our Saviour in the ſenſe of *Tranſubſtantiation.* If there be any, it muſt be from one of theſe two reaſons. Either becauſe there are no figurative expreſſions in Scripture, which I think no man ever yet ſaid: or elſe, becauſe a Sacrament admits of no figures; which would be very abſurd for any man to ſay, ſince it is of the very nature of a Sacrament to repreſent and exhibit ſome inviſible grace and benefit by an outward ſign and figure: And eſpecially ſince it cannot be denied, but that in the inſtitution of this very Sacrament our Saviour uſeth figurative expreſſions and ſeveral words which cannot be taken ſtrictly and literally. When he gave the Cup, he ſaid, *This Cup is the new Teſtament in my bloud, which is ſhed for you and for many for the remiſſion of Sins.* Where firſt, the *Cup* is put for *Wine* contained in the Cup; or elſe if the words be literally taken, ſo as to ſignify a ſubſtantial change, it is not of the *Wine* but of the *Cup*; and that, not into the *bloud of Chriſt*, but into the *new Teſtament* or *new Covenant* in his bloud. Beſides, that his bloud is ſaid *then* to be ſhed, and his body to be broken, which was not till his paſſion, which followed the Inſtitution and firſt celebration of this Sacrament.

(a) *de Euch. l. 3. c. 23.* (b) *in 3. diſ. 49. Qu. 75. Sect 2.* (c) *in 3 part. diſp. 180. Qu. 75. art. 2. c. 15.* (d) *in Sent. l. 4. diſt. 11. Qu. 1. n. 15.* (e) *in 4. Sent. Q. 5 & Quodl 4. Qu. 3.*

But that there is no neceſſity to underſtand our Saviour's words in the ſenſe of *Tranſubſtantiation*, I will take the plain conceſſion of a great number of the moſt learned Writers of the Church of *Rome* in this Controverſie. (a) *Bellarmine*, (b) *Suarez* and (c) *Vaſquez* do acknowledge *Scotus* the great *Schoolman* to have ſaid that this Doctrine cannot be evidently proved from Scripture: And *Bellarmine* grants this not to be improbable; and *Suarez* and *Vaſquez* acknowledge (d) *Durandus* to have ſaid as much. (e) *Ocham*, another famous Schoolman, ſays expreſly, that *the Doctrine*

Doctrine which holds the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine to remain after conſecration is neither repugnant to Reaſon nor to Scripture. (f) *Petrus ab Alliaco* Cardinal of *Cambray* ſays plainly, that *the Doctrine of the Subſtance of Bread and Wine remaining after Conſecration is more eaſie and free from abſurdity, more rational, and no ways repugnant to the authority of Scripture*; nay more, that for the other Doctrine, *viz.* of *Tranſubſtantiation*, *there is no evidence in Scripture.* (g) *Gabriel Biel*, another great Schoolman and Divine of their Church, freely declares, that *as to any thing expreſs'd in the Canon of the Scriptures, a man may believe that the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine doth remain after Conſecration:* and therefore he reſolves the belief of *Tranſubſtantiation* into ſome other Revelation, beſides Scripture, which he ſuppoſeth the Church had about it. Cardinal (h) *Cajetan* confeſſeth that *the Goſpel doth no where expreſs that the Bread is changed into the Body of Chriſt*; *that we have this from the authority of the Church:* nay, he goes farther, *that there is nothing in the Goſpel which enforceth any man to underſtand theſe words of Chriſt*, this is my body, *in a proper and not a metaphorical ſenſe*; *but the Church having underſtood them in a proper ſenſe, they are to be ſo explained*; Which words in the *Roman* Edition of *Cajetan* are expunged by order of Pope (i) *Pius* V. Cardinal (k) *Contarenus*, and (l) *Melchior Canus* one of the beſt and moſt judicious Writers that Church ever had, reckon this Doctrine among thoſe *which are not ſo expreſly found in Scripture.* I will add but one more, of great authority in the Church, and a reputed Martyr, (m) *Fiſher* Biſhop of *Rocheſter* who ingenuouſly confeſſeth, that in the words of the Inſtitution *there is not one word from whence the true preſence of the fleſh and bloud of Chriſt in our Maſs can be proved:* So that we need not much contend that this Doctrine hath no certain foundation in Scripture, when this is ſo fully and frankly acknowledged by our Adverſaries themſelves.

(f) *in 4. Sent. Q. 6. art. 2.*

(g) *in canon. Miſſ. Lect. 40.*

(h) *in Aquin. 3 part. Q. 75. art. 1.*

(i) *Ægid. Coninck. de Sacram. Q. 75. art. 1. n. 13.*

(k) *de Sacram. l. 2. c. 3.*

(l) *Loc. Theolog. l. 3. c. 3.*

(m) *Contra captiv. Babylon. c. 10. n. 2.*

Secondly, If there be no neceſſity of underſtanding our Saviour's words in the ſenſe of *Tranſubſtantiation*, I am ſure there is a great deal of reaſon to underſtand them otherwiſe. Whether we conſider the like ex-

preſſions in Scripture; as where our Saviour ſays he is *the door*, and *the true Vine* (which the Church of *Rome* would mightily have triumph'd in, had it been ſaid, *this is my true body.*) And ſo likewiſe where the Church is ſaid to be *Chriſt's body*; and the *Rock* which followed the *Iſraelites* to be *Chriſt*, 1 Cor. 10. 4. *They drank of that rock which followed them*, and *that rock was Chriſt*: All which and innumerable more like expreſſions in Scripture every man underſtands in a figurative, and not in a ſtrictly literal and abſurd ſenſe. And it is very well known, that in the *Hebrew* Language things are commonly ſaid to be that which they do ſignify and repreſent; and there is not in that Language a more proper and uſual way of expreſſing a thing to ſignify ſo and ſo, than to ſay that it is ſo and ſo. Thus *Joſeph* expounding *Pharaoh*'s dream to him, *Gen.* 41. 26. Says, *the ſeven good kine are ſeven years*, and *the ſeven good ears of corn are ſeven years*, that is, they ſignified or repreſented ſeven years of plenty; and ſo *Pharaoh* underſtood him, and ſo would any man of ſenſe underſtand the like expreſſions; nor do I believe that any ſenſible man, who had never heard of *Tranſubſtantiation* being grounded upon theſe words of our Saviour, *this is my body*, would upon reading the inſtitution of the Sacrament in the Goſpel ever have imagined any ſuch thing to be meant by our Saviour in thoſe words; but would have underſtood his meaning to have been, *this Bread* ſignifies my *Body*, this *Cup* ſignifies my *Bloud*; and this which you ſee me now doe, doe ye hereafter for a *Memorial* of me: But ſurely it would never have enter'd into any man's mind to have thought that our Saviour did literally hold himſelf in his hand, and give away himſelf from himſelf with his own hands.

Or whether we compare theſe words of our Saviour with the ancient Form of the Paſſover uſed by the *Jews* from *Ezra*'s time, as (n) *Juſtin Martyr* tells us, τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ καταφυγὴ ἡμῶν, *this Paſſover is our Saviour and our refuge*: not that they believed the Paſchal Lamb to be ſubſtantially changed either into God their Saviour who delivered them out

(n) *Dialog. cum* Tryph. p. 257. *Edit.* Pariſ. 1639.

out of the Land of *Egypt*, or into the *Meſſias* the Saviour whom they expected and who was ſignified by it: But this Lamb which they did eat did repreſent to them and put them in mind of that Salvation which God wrought for their Fathers in *Egypt*, when by the ſlaying of a Lamb and ſprinkling the bloud of it upon their doors their firſt-born were paſſed over and ſpared; and did likewiſe foreſhew the Salvation of the *Meſſias*, *the Lamb of God that was to take away the Sins of the world.*

And nothing is more common in all Languages than to give the name of the thing ſignified to the Sign. As the delivery of a Deed or Writing under hand and Seal is call'd a conveyance or making over of ſuch an Eſtate, and it is really ſo; not the delivery of mere wax and parchment, but the conveyance of a real Eſtate; as truly and really to all effects and purpoſes of Law, as if the very material houſes and lands themſelves could be and were actually delivered into my hands: In like manner the names of the things themſelves made over to us in the new Covenant of the Goſpel between God and man, are given to the Signs and Seals of that Covenant. By *Baptiſm* Chriſtians are ſaid to be *made partakers of the Holy Ghoſt*, *Heb.* 6. 4. And by the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper we are ſaid to *communicate* or to be made partakers *of the Body of Chriſt* which was broken, and of his Bloud which was ſhed for us, that is, of the real benefits of his death and paſſion. And thus St. *Paul* ſpeaks of this Sacrament, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. *The cup of bleſſing which we bleſs, is it not the communion of the bloud of Chriſt? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Chriſt?* But ſtill it is bread, and he ſtill calls it ſo, v. 17. *For we being many are one bread and one body; for we are partakers of that one bread.* The Church of *Rome* might, if they pleaſed, as well argue from hence that all Chriſtians are ſubſtantially changed firſt into Bread, and then into the natural Body of Chriſt by their participation of the Sacrament, becauſe they are ſaid thereby to be *one bread* and *one body*. And the ſame Apoſtle in the next *Chapter*,

ter, after he had ſpoken of the conſecration of the Elements ſtill calls them the *bread and the Cup*, in three *verſes* together, *As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup*, v. 26. *Whoſoever ſhall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily*, v. 27. *But let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of this bread and drink of that cup*, v. 28. And our Saviour himſelf when he had ſaid, *this is my bloud of the new Teſtament*, immediately adds, * *but I ſay unto you, I will not henceforth drink of this fruit of the Vine, untill I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom*, that is, not till after his reſurrection, which was the firſt ſtep of his exaltation into the Kingdom given him by his Father, when the Scripture tells us he did eat and drink with his Diſciples. But that which I obſerve from our Saviour's words is, that after the conſecration of the *Cup* and the delivering of it to his Diſciples to drink of it, he tells them that he would thenceforth drink no more of the fruit of the Vine, which he had now drank with them, till after his Reſurrection. From whence it is plain that it was the fruit of the Vine, real wine, which our Saviour drank of and communicated to his Diſciples in the Sacrament.

* Matth. 26. 29.

Beſides, if we conſider that he celebrated this Sacrament before his Paſſion, it is impoſſible theſe words ſhould be underſtood literally of the natural body and bloud of Chriſt; becauſe it was *his body broken* and *his bloud ſhed* which he gave to his Diſciples, which if we underſtand literally of his natural body broken and his bloud ſhed, then theſe words, *this is my body which is broken, and this is my bloud which is ſhed*, could not be true, becauſe his Body was then whole and unbroken, and his bloud not then ſhed; nor could it be a *propitiatory Sacrifice* (as they affirm this Sacrament to be) unleſs they will ſay that propitiation was made before Chriſt ſuffer'd: And it is likewiſe impoſſible that the Diſciples ſhould underſtand theſe words literally, becauſe they not onely plainly ſaw that what he gave them was *Bread* and *Wine*, but they ſaw likewiſe as plainly that it was not his Body which was given,

but

but his Body which gave that which was given; not his body *broken* and his bloud *ſhed*, becauſe they ſaw him alive at that very time and beheld his body whole and unpierc'd; and therefore they could not underſtand theſe words literally: If they did, can we imagine that the Diſciples, who upon all other occaſions were ſo full of queſtions and objections, ſhould make no difficulty of this matter? nor ſo much as ask our Saviour, *how* can theſe things be? that they ſhould not tell him, we ſee this to be Bread and that to be Wine, and we ſee thy Body to be diſtinct from both; we ſee thy Body not broken, and thy Bloud not ſhed.

From all which it muſt needs be very evident, to any man that will impartially conſider things, how little reaſon there is to underſtand thoſe words of our Saviour, *this is my body*, and *this is my bloud*, in the ſenſe of *Tranſubſtantiation*; nay on the contrary, that there is very great reaſon and an evident neceſſity to underſtand them otherwiſe. I proceed to ſhew,

2*ly*. That this Doctrine is not grounded upon the *perpetual belief of the Chriſtian Church*, which the Church of *Rome* vainly pretends as an evidence that the Church did always underſtand and interpret our Saviour's words in this ſenſe.

To manifeſt the groundleſneſs of this pretence, I ſhall, 1. ſhew by plain teſtimony of the *Fathers* in ſeveral Ages, that this Doctrine was not the belief of the ancient Chriſtian Church. 2. I ſhall ſhew the time and occaſion of its coming in, and by what degrees it grew up and was eſtabliſh'd in the *Roman* Church. 3. I ſhall anſwer their great pretended Demonſtration that this always was and muſt have been the conſtant belief of the Chriſtian Church.

1. I ſhall ſhew by plain Teſtimonies of the *Fathers* in ſeveral Ages, for above five hundred years after Chriſt, that this Doctrine was not the *belief of the ancient Chriſtian Church*. I deny not but that the *Fathers* do, and that with great reaſon, very much magnify the wonderfull myſtery and efficacy of this Sacrament, and frequently ſpeak of a great Supernatural change

change made by the divine benediction; which we alſo readily acknowledge. They ſay indeed, that the Elements of Bread and Wine do by the divine bleſſing become to us the Body and Bloud of Chriſt: But they likewiſe ſay that the names of the things ſignified are given to the Signs; that the Bread and Wine do ſtill remain in their proper nature and ſubſtance, and that they are turn'd into the ſubſtance of our Bodies; that the Body of Chriſt in the Sacrament is not his natural Body, but the ſign and figure of it; not that Body which was crucified, nor that Bloud which was ſhed upon the Croſs; and that it is impious to underſtand the *eating of the fleſh of the Son of man* and *drinking his bloud* literally: all which are directly oppoſite to the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* and utterly inconſiſtent with it. I will ſelect but ſome few Teſtimonies of many which I might bring to this purpoſe.

I begin with *Juſtin Martyr*, who ſays expreſly, that * *our bloud* and *fleſh are nouriſhed* by the converſion *of that food* which we receive in the *Euchariſt*: But *that* cannot be the natural body and bloud of Chriſt, for no man will ſay that *that* is converted into the nouriſhment of our bodies.

* *Apol.* 2. p. 98. *Edit.* Pariſ. 1636.

The *Second* is * *Irenæus*, who ſpeaking of this Sacrament ſays, that the *bread which is from the earth receiving the divine invocation is now no longer common bread, but the Euchariſt* (or Sacrament) *conſiſting of two things, the one earthly, the other heavenly.* He ſays it is no longer common bread, but after invocation or conſecration it becomes the Sacrament, that is, bread ſanctified, conſiſting of two things an earthly and a heavenly; the earthly thing is bread, and the heavenly is the divine bleſſing which by the invocation or conſecration is added to it. And * elſewhere he hath this paſſage, *when therefore the cup that is mix'd* (that is, of Wine and Water) *and the bread that is broken receives the word of God, it becomes the Euchariſt of the bloud and body of Chriſt, of which the ſubſtance of our fleſh is increaſed and conſiſts*: but if that which we receive in the Sacrament do nouriſh our bodies, it

* *Lib* 4. c. 34.

* *Lib.* 5. c. 2.

muſt

must be bread and wine, and not the natural body and bloud of Christ. There is another remarkable Testimony of *Irenæus*, which though it be not now extant in those *works* of his which remain, yet hath been preserv'd by * *Oecumenius*, and it is this; when (says he) *the Greeks had taken some Servants, of the Christian Catechumeni* (that is, such as had not been admitted to the Sacrament) *and afterwards urged them by violence to tell them some of the secrets of the Christians, these Servants having nothing to say that might gratify those who offered violence to them, except onely that they had heard from their Masters that the divine Communion was the bloud and body of Christ, they thinking that it was really bloud and flesh, declar'd as much to those that questioned them. The Greeks taking this as if it were really done by the Christians, discovered it to others of the Greeks; who hereupon put* Sanctus *and* Blandina *to the torture to make them confess it. To whom* Blandina *boldly answered, How would they endure to doe this, who by way of exercise* (or abstinence) *do not eat that flesh which may lawfully be eaten?* By which it appears that this which they would have charg'd upon *Christians*, as if they had literally eaten the flesh and bloud of Christ in the Sacrament, was a false accusation which these Martyrs denied, saying they were so far from that that they for their part did not eat any flesh at all.

* *Comment. in* 1 Pet. c. 3.

The next is *Tertullian*, who proves against *Marcion* the Heretique that the Body of our Saviour was not a mere phantasm and appearance, but a real Body, because the Sacrament is a figure and image of his Body; and if there be an image of his body he must have a real body, otherwise the Sacrament would be an image of an image. His words are these, * *the bread which our Saviour took and distributed to his Disciples he made his own body, saying this is my body, that is, the image or figure of my body. But it could not have been the figure of his body, if there had not been a true and real body.* And arguing against the *Scepticks* who denied the certainty of sense he useth this Argument: That if we question our senses we may doubt whether our Blessed Saviour were not deceived in what he heard, and

* *Adverſ.* Marcionem. *l.* 4. *p.* 371. *Edit.* Rigalt. Pariſ. 1634.

and ſaw, and touched. * *He might* (ſays he) *be deceived in the voice from heaven, in the ſmell of the ointment with which he was anointed againſt his burial; and in the taſte of the wine which he conſecrated in remembrance of his bloud.* So that it ſeems we are to truſt our ſenſes, even in the matter of the Sacrament; and if that be true, the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* is certainly falſe.

* *Lib. de Anima, p. 319.*

* *Edit. Huetii.*

Origen in his * Comment on *Matth.* 15. ſpeaking of the Sacrament hath this paſſage, *That food which is ſanctified by the word of God and prayer, as to that of it which is material, goeth into the belly and is caſt out into the draught,* which none ſurely will ſay of the Body of Chriſt. And afterwards he adds by way of explication, *it is not the matter of the bread, but the word which is ſpoken over it, which profiteth him that worthily eateth the Lord; and this* (he ſays) *he had ſpoken concerning the typical and Symbolical body.* So that the matter of bread remaineth in the Sacrament, and this *Origen* calls the *typical and Symbolical* body of Chriſt; and it is not the natural body of Chriſt which is there eaten, for the food eaten in the Sacrament, as to that of it which is material, goeth into the belly and is caſt out into the draught. This teſtimony is ſo very plain in the Cauſe that *Sextus Senenſis* ſuſpects this place of *Origen* was depraved by the Heretiques. *Cardinal Perron* is contented to allow it to be *Origen*'s, but rejects his teſtimony becauſe he was accuſed of Hereſie by ſome of the Fathers, and ſays he talks like a Heretique in this place. So that with much ado this teſtimony is yielded to us. The ſame *Father* in his * *Homilies* upon *Leviticus* ſpeaks thus, *There is alſo in the New Teſtament a letter which kills him who doth not Spiritually underſtand thoſe things which are ſaid; for if we take according to the Letter that which is ſaid,* EXCEPT YE EAT MY FLESH AND DRINK MY BLOUD, *this Letter kills.* And this alſo is a killing Teſtimony, and not to be anſwered but in Cardinal *Perron*'s way, by ſaying *he talks like a Heretique.*

* *Cap. 10.*

* *Ep. 63.*

St. *Cyprian* hath a whole Epiſtle * to *Cecilius*, againſt thoſe who gave the Communion in Water onely with-

without Wine mingled with it; and his main argument againſt them is this, that *the bloud of Chriſt with which we are redeemed and quickened cannot ſeem to be in the Cup when there is no Wine in the Cup by which the Bloud of Chriſt is repreſented:* and afterwards he ſays, that *contrary to the Evangelical and Apoſtolical Doctrine Water was in ſome places* offer'd (or given) *in the Lord's Cup, which* (ſays he) *alone cannot expreſs* (or repreſent) *the bloud of Chriſt.* And laſtly he tells us, that *by water* the people is underſtood, *by Wine the bloud of Chriſt is ſhewn* (or repreſented) *but when in the Cup water is mingled with Wine the people is united to Chriſt.* So that according to this Argument *Wine* in the Sacramental *Cup* is no otherwiſe chang'd into the *bloud of Chriſt than the water* mixed with it is changed into the *People*, which are ſaid to be *united to Chriſt.*

I omit many others, and paſs to St. *Auſtin* in the *fourth Age* after Chriſt. And I the rather inſiſt upon his Teſtimony, becauſe of his eminent eſteem and authority in the *Latin* Church; and he alſo calls the *Elements* of the Sacrament the *figure and Sign of Chriſt's body and bloud.* In his Book againſt *Adimantus* the *Manichee* we have this expreſſion, * *our Lord did not doubt to ſay, this is my Body, when he gave the Sign of his Body.* And in his explication of the third *Pſalm*, ſpeaking of *Judas* whom our Lord admitted to *his* laſt Supper, *in which* (ſays he) † *he commended and delivered to his Diſciples the figure of his Body*; Language which would now be cenſur'd for Hereſie in the Church of *Rome.* Indeed he was never *accus'd of Hereſie*, as Cardinal *Perron* ſays *Origen* was, but *he talks as like* one as *Origen* himſelf. And in his *Comment* on the 98 *Pſalm* ſpeaking of the offence which the Diſciples took at that ſaying of our Saviour, *except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of man and drink his bloud, &c.* he brings in our Saviour ſpeaking thus to them, ‖ *ye muſt underſtand Spiritually what I have ſaid unto you; ye are not to eat this body which ye ſee, and to drink that bloud which ſhall be ſhed by thoſe that ſhall crucify me. I have commended a certain Sacrament to you, which being Spiritually underſtood will give you life.* What more oppoſite to the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, than

* Aug. *Tom.* 6. *p.* 187. *Edit.* Baſil. 1569.

† *Enarrat. in* Pſal. *Tom.* 8. *p.* 16.

‖ *Id. Tom.* 9. *p.* 1105.

than that the Diſciples were not to eat that Body of Chriſt which they ſaw, nor to drink that bloud which was ſhed upon the Croſs, but that all this was to be underſtood ſpiritually and according to the nature of a Sacrament? For *that body* he tells us is not here but in heaven, in his Comment upon theſe words, *me ye have not always.* * *He ſpeaks* (ſays he) *of the preſence of his body; ye ſhall have me according to my providence, according to Majeſty and inviſible grace; but according to the fleſh which the word aſſumed, according to that which was born of the Virgin Mary, ye ſhall not have me: therefore becauſe he converſed with his Diſciples forty days, he is aſcended up into heaven and is not here.*

* *Id. Tract. 50. in* Johan.

In his 23d. Epiſtle; † *if the Sacraments* (ſays he) *had not ſome reſemblance of thoſe things whereof they are Sacraments, they would not be Sacraments at all; but from this reſemblance they take for the moſt part the names of the things which they repreſent. Therefore as the Sacrament of the body of Chriſt is in ſome manner or ſenſe Chriſt's body, and the Sacrament of his bloud is the bloud of Chriſt; So the Sacrament of faith* (meaning *Baptiſm*) *is faith.* Upon which words of St. *Auſtin* there is this remarkable *Gloſs* in their own *Canon Law*; || *the heavenly Sacrament which truly repreſents the fleſh of Chriſt is called the body of Chriſt; but improperly: whence it is ſaid, that after a manner, but not according to the truth of the thing but the myſtery of the thing ſignified; So that the meaning is, it is called the body of Chriſt, that is, it ſignifies the body of Chriſt:* And if this be St. *Auſtin*'s meaning, I am ſure no *Proteſtant* can ſpeak more plainly againſt *Tranſubſtantiation.* And in the ancient *Canon* of the *Maſs*, before it was chang'd in compliance with this new Doctrine, it is expreſly call'd *a Sacrament, a Sign, an Image and a figure of Chriſt's body.* To which I will add that remarkable paſſage of St. *Auſtin* cited by * *Gratian, that as we receive the ſimilitude of his death in Baptiſm, ſo we may alſo receive the likeneſs of his fleſh and bloud; that ſo neither may truth be wanting in the Sacrament, nor Pagans have occaſion to make us ridiculous for drinking the bloud of one that was ſlain.*

† *Id. Tom. 2. p. 93.*

|| *De Conſecr. diſt. 2. Hoc eſt.*

* *De Conſecr. diſt. 2. Sect. Utrum.*

I will mention but one Teſtimony more of this *Father*, but ſo clear a one as it is impoſſible any man in

in his wits that had believed *Tranſubſtantiation* could have utter'd. It is in his *Treatiſe* * *de Doctrina Chriſtiana*; where laying down ſeveral Rules for the right underſtanding of Scripture, he gives this for one. *If* (ſays he) *the ſpeech be a precept forbidding ſome heinous wickedneſs or crime, or commanding us to doe good, it is not figurative; but if it ſeem to command any heinous wickedneſs or crime, or to forbid that which is profitable and beneficial to others, it is figurative. For example, Except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of man and drink his bloud, ye have no life in you: This ſeems to command a heinous wickedneſs and crime, therefore it is a figure; commanding us to communicate of the paſſion of our Lord, and with delight and advantage to lay up in our memory that his fleſh was crucified and wounded for us.* So that, according to St. *Auſtin*'s beſt skill in interpreting Scripture, the *literal eating* of the fleſh of Chriſt and drinking his bloud would have been a great impiety; and therefore the expreſſion is to be underſtood *figuratively*; not as Cardinal *Perron* would have it, onely in oppoſition to the eating of his fleſh and bloud in the groſs appearance of fleſh and bloud, but to the real eating of his natural body and bloud under any appearance whatſoever: For St. *Auſtin* doth not ſay, this is a Figurative ſpeech wherein we are commanded really to feed upon the natural body and bloud of Chriſt under the *ſpecies* of bread and wine, as the *Cardinal* would underſtand him; for then the ſpeech would be literal and not figurative: But he ſays, this is a figurative ſpeech wherein we are commanded ſpiritually to feed upon the remembrance of his Paſſion.

* *Lib.* 3. *Tom.* 3. *p.* 53.

To theſe I will add but *three* or *four* Teſtimonies more in the *two* following Ages.

The firſt ſhall be of *Theodoret*, who ſpeaking of that * Prophecy of *Jacob* concerning our Saviour, *he waſhed his garments in Wine and his clothes in the bloud of grapes*, hath theſe words, † *as we call the myſtical fruit of the Vine* (that is, the Wine in the Sacrament) *after conſecration the bloud of the Lord, ſo he* (viz. *Jacob*) *calls the bloud of the true Vine* (*viz.* of Chriſt) *the bloud of the grape*: but the bloud of Chriſt is not literally and properly but

* Gen. 49. 11.

† *Dialog.* 1.

onely figuratively the bloud of the grape, in the ſame ſenſe as he is ſaid to be the true Vine; and therefore the Wine in the Sacrament after conſecration is in like manner not literally and properly but figuratively the bloud of Chriſt. And he explains this afterwards, ſaying, that *our Saviour changed the names, and gave to his Body the name of the Symbol or Sign, and to the Symbol or Sign the name of his Body; thus when he had call'd himſelf the Vine, he call'd the Symbol or Sign his bloud*; ſo that in the ſame ſenſe that he call'd himſelf the Vine, he call'd the Wine, which is the Symbol of his bloud, his bloud: *For*, ſays he, *he would have thoſe who partake of the divine myſteries not to attend to the nature of the things which are ſeen, but by the change of names to believe the change which is made by grace; for he who call'd that which by nature is a body wheat and bread, and again likewiſe call'd himſelf the Vine, he honour'd the Symbols with the name of his body and bloud: not changing nature but adding grace to nature.* Where you ſee he ſays expreſly, that when he call'd the *Symbols* or Elements of the Sacrament, viz. *Bread and Wine* his *Body and Bloud*, he made no change in the nature of the things, onely added grace to nature, that is, by the Divine grace and bleſſing he raiſed them to a Spiritual and Supernatural virtue and efficacy.

The *Second* is of the ſame *Theodoret* in his ſecond Dialogue between a *Catholique*, under the name of *Orthodoxus*, and an *Heretique*, under the name of *Eraniſtes*; who maintaining that the Humanity of Chriſt was chang'd into the ſubſtance of the Divinity (which was the Hereſie of *Eutyches*) he illuſtrates the matter by this Similitude, *As*, ſays he, *the Symbols of the Lord's body and bloud are one thing before the invocation of the Prieſt, but after the invocation are changed and become another thing; So the body of our Lord after his aſcenſion is changed into the divine ſubſtance.* But what ſays the Catholick *Orthodoxus* to this? why, he talks juſt like one of Cardinal *Perron*'s Heretiques, *Thou art*, ſays he, *caught in thy own net: becauſe the myſtical Symbols after conſecration do not paſs out of their own nature; for they remain in their former ſubſtance, figure and appearance and may be ſeen and handled*

dled even as before. He does not onely deny the outward figure and appearance of the Symbols to be chang'd, but the nature and ſubſtance of them, even in the proper and ſtricteſt ſenſe of the word ſubſtance; and it was neceſſary ſo to do, otherwiſe he had not given a pertinent anſwer to the ſimilitude urg'd againſt him.

The next is one of their own Popes, *Gelaſius*, who brings the ſame Inſtance againſt the *Eutychians*; * ſurely, ſays he, *the Sacraments which we receive of the body and blond of our Lord are a divine thing, ſo that by them we are made partakers of a divine nature, and yet it ceaſeth not to be the ſubſtance or nature of Bread and Wine; and certainly the image and reſemblance of Chriſt's body and bloud are celebrated in the action of the myſteries*, that is, in the Sacrament. To make this Inſtance of any force againſt the *Eutychians*, who held that the body of Chriſt upon his aſcenſion ceas'd and was chang'd into the ſubſtance of his Divinity, it was neceſſary to deny that there was any ſubſtantial change in the Sacrament of the bread and wine into the body and bloud of Chriſt. So that here is an infallible authority, one of their own Popes expreſly againſt *Tranſubſtantiation.*

* *Biblioth. Patr. Tom. 4.*

The laſt Teſtimony I ſhall produce is of *Facundus* an *African* Biſhop, who lived in the 6*th.* Century. Upon occaſion of juſtifying an expreſſion of one who had ſaid that *Chriſt alſo received the adoption of Sons*, he reaſons thus. * *Chriſt vouchſafed to receive the Sacrament of adoption both when he was circumciſed and baptized: And the Sacrament of Adoption may be called adoption, as the Sacrament of his body and bloud, which is in the conſecrated bread and cup, is by us called his body and bloud: not that the bread*, ſays he, *is properly his body and the cup his bloud, but becauſe they contain in them the myſteries of his body and bloud; hence alſo our Lord himſelf called the bleſſed bread and cup which he gave to his Diſciples his body and bloud.* Can any man after this believe, that it was then, and had ever been, the univerſal and received Doctrine of the Chriſtian Church, that the bread and wine in the Sacrament are ſubſtantially changed into the proper and natural body and bloud of Chriſt?

* Facund. p. 144. Edit. Pariſ. 1676.

By these plain Testimonies which I have produced, and I might have brought a great many more to the same purpose, it is I think evident beyond all denial that *Transubstantiation* hath not been *the perpetual belief of the Christian Church.* And this likewise is acknowledged by many great and learned men of the *Roman Church.* (a) *Scotus* acknowledgeth, that this Doctrine was not always thought necessary to be believed, but that the necessity of believing it was consequent to that Declaration of the Church made in the Council of *Lateran* under Pope *Innocent* the III. And (b) *Durandus* freely discovers his inclination *to have believed the contrary, if the Church had not by that determination obliged men to believe it.* (c) *Tonstal* Bishop of *Durham* also yields, that *before the Lateran Council men were at liberty as to the manner of Christ's presence in the Sacrament.* And (d) *Erasmus*, who lived and died in the communion of the *Roman* Church, and than whom no man was better read in the ancient *Fathers*, doth confess that it *was late before the Church defined Transubstantiation, unknown to the Ancients both name and thing.* And (e) *Alphonsus a Castro* says plainly, that *concerning the Transubstantiation of the bread into the body of Christ, there is seldom any mention in the ancient Writers.* And who can imagine that these learned men would have granted the ancient Church and Fathers to have been so much Strangers to this Doctrine, had they thought it to have been the perpetual belief of the Church? I shall now in the

(a) *In Sent. l. 4. dist. 11. q. 3.*

(b) *In Sent. l. 4. dist. 11. q. 1. n. 15.*

(c) *de Euchar. l. 1. p. 146.*

(d) *In 1 Epist. ad Corinth. c. 7. citante etiam* Salmerone, *Tom. 9. Tract. 16. p. 108.*

(e) *De Haeres. l. 8.*

Second place, give an account of the *particular time and occasion of the coming in of this Doctrine*, and by what steps and degrees it grew up and was advanced into an *Article* of Faith in the *Romish Church.* The Doctrine of the *corporal presence of Christ* was first started upon occasion of the Dispute about the *Worship of Images*, in opposition whereto the *Synod* of *Constantinople* about the year DCCL did argue thus, That our Lord having left us no other image of himself but the Sacrament, in which the substance of bread is the image of his body, we ought to make no other image of our Lord. In answer to this Argument the second *Council*

of

of Nice in the year DCCLXXXVII did declare, that the Sacrament after Conſecration *is not the image and antitype* of Chriſt's body and bloud, but is *properly* his body and bloud. So that the *corporal body of Chriſt in the Sacrament* was firſt brought *in to ſupport the ſtupid worſhip of Images:* And indeed it could never have come in upon a more proper occaſion, nor have been applied to a fitter purpoſe.

And here I cannot but take notice how well this agrees with * *Bellarmine*'s Obſervation, that *none of the Ancients who wrote of Hereſies, hath put this errour* (viz. of denying *Tranſubſtantiation*) *in his Catalogue*; *nor did any of the Ancients diſpute againſt this errour for the firſt* 600 *years.* Which is very true, becauſe there could be no occaſion then to diſpute againſt thoſe who denied *Tranſubſtantiation*; ſince, as I have ſhewn, this Doctrine was not in being, unleſs amongſt the *Eutychian* Heretiques, for the firſt 600 years and more. But † *Bellarmine* goes on and tells us, that the *firſt who call'd in queſtion the truth of the body of the Lord in the Euchariſt were the* ICONOMACHI (the oppoſers of Images) *after the year* DCC *in the Council of Conſtantinople*; *for theſe ſaid there was one image of Chriſt inſtituted by Chriſt himſelf*, viz. *the bread and wine in the Euchariſt, which repreſents the body and bloud of Chriſt: Wherefore from that time the Greek Writers often admoniſh us that the Euchariſt is not the figure or image of the body of the Lord, but his true body, as appears from the* VII. *Synod*; which agrees moſt exactly with the account which I have given of the firſt riſe of this Doctrine, which began with the *corporal preſence of Chriſt* in the Sacrament, and afterwards proceeded to *Tranſubſtantiation.*

* *De Euchariſt. l.* 1. *c.* 1.

† *Ibid.*

And as this was the firſt occaſion of introducing this *Doctrine* among the *Greeks*, ſo in the *Latin* or *Roman* Church *Paſchaſius Radbertus*, firſt a *Monk*, and afterwards *Abbat* of *Corbey*, was the firſt broacher of it in the year DCCCXVIII.

And for this, beſides the Evidence of Hiſtory, we have the acknowledgment of *two* very Eminent Perſons in the Church of *Rome*, *Bellarmine* and *Sirmondus*, who do in effect confeſs that this *Paſchaſius* was the

first who wrote to purpose upon this Argument. * *Bellarmine* in these words, *This Authour was the first who hath seriously and copiously written concerning the truth of Christ's body and bloud in the Eucharist:* And † *Sirmondus* in these, *he so first explained the genuine sense of the Catholick Church, that he opened the way to the rest who afterwards in great numbers wrote upon the same Argument:* But though *Sirmondus* is pleased to say that he onely first explain'd the sense of the Catholique Church in this Point, yet it is very plain from the Records of that Age which are left to us, that this was the first time that this Doctrine was broached in the *Latin* Church; and it met with great opposition in that Age, as I shall have occasion hereafter to shew. For *Rabanus Maurus* Arch-bishop of *Mentz* about the year DCCCXLVII reciting the very words of *Paschasius* wherein he had deliver'd this Doctrine, hath this remarkable passage concerning the novelty of it; ‖ *Some,* says he, *of late, not having a right opinion concerning the Sacrament of the body and bloud of our Lord, have said that this is the body and bloud of our Lord which was born of the Virgin Mary, and in which our Lord suffered upon the Cross, and rose from the dead: which errour,* says he, *we have oppos'd with all our might.* From whence it is plain, by the Testimony of one of the greatest and most learned Bishops of that Age, and of eminent reputation for Piety, that what is now the very Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* concerning the Sacrament, was then esteem'd an Errour broach'd by some particular Persons, but was far from being the generally receiv'd Doctrine of that Age. Can any one think it possible, that so eminent a Person in the Church both for piety and learning, could have condemn'd this Doctrine as an Errour and a Novelty, had it been the general Doctrine of the Christian Church, not onely in that, but in all former Ages; and no censure pass'd upon him for that which is now *the great burning Article* in the Church of *Rome*, and esteemed by them one of the greatest and most pernicious Heresies?

* *De Scriptor. Eccles.*

† *In vita Paschasii.*

‖ *Epist. ad Heribaldum. c.* 33.

Afterwards in the year MLIX, when *Berengarius* in *France* and *Germany* had rais'd a fresh opposition against

gainſt this Doctrine, he was compell'd to recant it by Pope *Nicholas* and the *Council at Rome*, in theſe words, * *That the bread and wine which are ſet upon the Altar, after the conſecration are not onely the Sacrament, but the true body and bloud of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; and are ſenſibly, not onely in the Sacrament, but in truth, handled and broken by the hands of the Prieſt, and ground or bruiſed by the teeth of the faithfull.* But it ſeems the *Pope* and his *Council* were not then skilfull enough to expreſs themſelves rightly in this matter; for the *Gloſs* upon the *Canon Law* ſays expreſly, † *that unleſs we underſtand theſe words of BERENGARIUS* (that is in truth of the *Pope and his Council*) *in a ſound ſenſe, we ſhall fall into a greater Hereſie than that of BERENGARIUS; for we do not make parts of the body of Chriſt.* The meaning of which *Gloſs* I cannot imagine, unleſs it be this, that the *Body of Chriſt*, though it be in truth *broken*, yet it is not *broken into parts (for we do not make parts of the body of Chriſt,)* but into *wholes*: Now this new way of *breaking a Body*, not into *parts*, but into *wholes* (which in good earneſt is the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*) though to them that are able to believe *Tranſubſtantiation* it may for any thing I know appear to be *ſound ſenſe*, yet to us that cannot believe ſo it appears to be *ſolid nonſenſe*.

* Gratian. *de conſecrat. diſtinct.* 2. Lanfranc. *de corp. & ſang. Domini. c.* 5. Guitmund. *de Sacram. l.* 1. Alger. *de Sacram. l.* 1. *c.* 19.

† *Gloſs. Decret. de conſecrat. diſt.* 2. *in cap. Ego* Berengarius.

About XX years after, in the year MLXXIX Pope *Gregory* the VII*th.* began to be ſenſible of this abſurdity; and therefore in another *Council* at *Rome* made *Berengarius* to recant in another *Form*, viz. * *that the bread and wine which are placed upon the Altar are ſubſtantially changed into the true and proper and quickning fleſh and bloud of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and after conſecration are the true body of Chriſt, which was born of the Virgin, and which being offered for the Salvation of the World did hang upon the Croſs, and ſits on the right hand of the Father.*

* *Walldenſ. Tom.* 2. *c.* 13

So that from the firſt ſtarting of this Doctrine in the *ſecond Council of Nice* in the year DCCLXXXVII, till the *Council* under Pope *Gregory* the VII*th.* in the year MLXXIX, it was almoſt three hundred years that this Doctrine was conteſted, and before this

miſhapen *Monſter of Tranſubſtantiation could be lick'd* into that Form in which it is now ſetled and eſtabliſh'd in the Church of *Rome*. Here then is a plain account of the riſe of this Doctrine, and of the ſeveral ſteps whereby it was advanced by the Church of *Rome* into an *Article of Faith*. I come now in the

Third place, to anſwer the great pretended *Demonſtration* of the *impoſſibility that this Doctrine, if it had been new, ſhould ever have come in, in any Age, and been received in the Church; and conſequently it muſt of neceſſity have been the perpetual belief of the Church in all Ages:* For if it had not always been the Doctrine of the Church, whenever it had attempted firſt to come in, there would have been a great ſtir and buſtle about it, and the whole Chriſtian World would have roſe up in oppoſition to it. But *we* can ſhew no ſuch time when firſt it came in, and when any ſuch oppoſition was made to it, and therefore it was always the Doctrine of the Church. This *Demonſtration* Monſieur *Arnauld*, a very learned Man in *France*, pretends to be unanſwerable: whether it be ſo or not, I ſhall briefly examine. And

Firſt, We do aſſign a punctual and very likely time of the firſt riſe of this Doctrine, about the beginning of the *ninth* Age; though it did not take firm root, nor was fully ſetled and eſtabliſh'd till towards the end of the *eleventh*. And this was the moſt likely time of all other, from the beginning of Chriſtianity, for ſo groſs an Errour to appear; it being, by the confeſſion and conſent of their own *Hiſtorians*, the moſt dark and diſmal time that ever happened to the Chriſtian Church, both for *Ignorance*, and *Superſtition*, and *Vice*. It came in together with *Idolatry*, and was made uſe of to ſupport it: A fit prop and companion for it. And indeed what *tares* might not the Enemy have *ſown* in ſo dark and long a *Night*; when ſo conſiderable a part of the Chriſtian World was lull'd aſleep in profound Ignorance and Superſtition? And this agrees very well with the account which our *Saviour* himſelf gives in the *Parable* of the *Tares*, of the ſpringing up of Errours and Corruptions

ruptions in the Field of the Church. * *While the men ſlept* the Enemy did his work in the Night, ſo that when they were awake they wondered how and whence the *tares* came; but being ſure they were there, and that they were not ſown at firſt, they concluded *the Enemy had done it.* * Matt. 13. 24.

Secondly, I have ſhewn likewiſe that there was *conſiderable oppoſition* made to this *Errour* at its firſt coming in. The general Ignorance and groſs Superſtition of that Age rendered the generality of people more quiet and ſecure, and diſpoſed them to receive any thing that came under a pretence of Myſtery in Religion and of greater reverence and devotion to the Sacrament, and that ſeemed any way to countenance the worſhip of *Images*, for which at that time they were zealouſly concern'd. But notwithſtanding the ſecurity and paſſive temper of the People, the men moſt eminent for piety and learning in that Time made great reſiſtance againſt it. I have already named *Rabanus* Arch-Biſhop of *Mentz*, who oppos'd it as an Errour lately ſprung up, and which had then gained but upon ſome few perſons. To whom I may add *Heribaldus* Biſhop of *Auxerres* in *France*, *Io. Scotus Erigena*, and *Ratramnus* commonly known by the name of *Bertram*, who at the ſame time were employed by the Emperour *Charles* the *Bald* to oppoſe this growing Errour, and wrote learnedly againſt it. And theſe were the eminent men for learning in that time. And becauſe Monſieur *Arnauld* will not be ſatisfied unleſs there were ſome ſtir and buſtle about it; *Bertram* in his *Preface* to his Book tells us, that they *who according to their ſeveral opinions talked differently about the myſtery of Chriſt's body and bloud were divided by no ſmall Schiſm.*

Thirdly, Though for a more clear and ſatisfactory anſwer to this pretended *Demonſtration* I have been contented to untie this knot, yet I could without all theſe pains have cut it. For ſuppoſe this Doctrine had ſilently come in and without oppoſition, ſo that we could not aſſign the particular time and occaſion of its firſt Riſe; yet if it be evident from the Records

cords of former Ages, for above D. years together, that this was not the ancient belief of the Church; and plain alſo, that this Doctrine was afterwards received in the *Roman* Church, though we could not tell how and when it came in, yet it would be the wildeſt and moſt extravagant thing in the world to ſet up a pretended Demonſtration of Reaſon againſt plain Experience and matter of Fact. This is juſt *Zeno*'s Demonſtration of the impoſſibility of motion againſt *Diogenes* walking before his Eyes. For this is to undertake to prove that impoſſible to have been, which moſt certainly was. Juſt thus the *Servants* in the *Parable* might have demonſtrated that the *tares* were *wheat*, becauſe they were ſure none but good ſeed was ſown at firſt, and no man could give any account of the punctual time when any *tares* were ſown, or by whom; and if any Enemy had come to doe it, he muſt needs have met with great reſiſtance and oppoſition; but no ſuch reſiſtance was made, and therefore there could be no *tares* in the *field*, but that which they call'd *tares* was certainly *good wheat*. At the ſame rate a man might demonſtrate that *our King*, his *Majeſty of great Britain*, is not return'd into *England*, nor reſtor'd to his Crown; becauſe there being ſo great and powerfull an Army poſſeſs'd of his Lands, and therefore obliged by intereſt to keep him out, it was impoſſible He ſhould ever come in without a great deal of fighting and bloudſhed: but there was no ſuch thing, therefore he is not return'd and reſtor'd to his Crown. And by the like kind of Demonſtration one might prove that the *Turk* did not invade *Chriſtendom* laſt year, and beſiege *Vienna*; becauſe if he had, the moſt *Chriſtian King*, who had the greateſt Army in *Chriſtendom* in a readineſs, would certainly have employed it againſt him; but Monſieur *Arnauld* certainly knows no ſuch thing was done: And therefore according to his way of Demonſtration, the *matter of fact*, ſo commonly reported and believed, concerning the *Turks Invaſion of Chriſtendom* and *beſieging Vienna* laſt year, was a perfect miſtake. But a man may demonſtrate till his

his head and heart ake, before he ſhall ever be able to prove that which certainly is, or was, never to have been. For of all ſorts of impoſſibles nothing is more evidently ſo, than to make that which hath been not to have been. All the reaſon in the world is too weak to cope with ſo tough and obſtinate a difficulty. And I have often wonder'd how a man of Monſieur *Arnauld*'s great wit and ſharp judgment could prevail with himſelf to engage in ſo bad and baffled a Cauſe; or could think to defend it with ſo *wooden a Dagger* as his *Demonſtration* of *Reaſon* againſt certain *Experience* and *matter of Fact*: A thing, if it be poſſible, of equal abſurdity with what he pretends to demonſtrate, *Tranſubſtantiation* it ſelf. I proceed to the

Third pretended Ground of this Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*; and that is, *The Infallible Authority of the preſent Church to make and declare new Articles of Faith.* And this in truth is the ground into which the moſt of the learned men of their Church did heretofore, and many do ſtill reſolve their belief of this Doctrine: And, as I have already ſhewn, do plainly ſay that they ſee no ſufficient reaſon, either from *Scripture* or *Tradition*, for the belief of it: And that they ſhould have believed the contrary had not the determination of the Church obliged them otherwiſe.

But if this Doctrine be obtruded upon the world merely by virtue of the Authority of the *Roman* Church, and the Declaration of the *Council* under Pope *Gregory* the VII*th.* or of the *Lateran Council* under *Innocent* the III*d.* then it is a plain Innovation in the Chriſtian Doctrine, and a new Article of Faith impos'd upon the Chriſtian World. And if any Church hath this power, the Chriſtian Faith may be enlarged and changed as often as men pleaſe; and that which is no part of our Saviour's Doctrine, nay, any thing, though never ſo abſurd and unreaſonable, may become an Article of Faith obliging all Chriſtians to the belief of it, whenever the Church of *Rome* ſhall think fit to ſtamp her Authority upon it:

which

which would make Christianity a most uncertain and endless thing.

The *Fourth* pretended ground of this Doctrine is, *the necessity of such a change as this in the Sacrament to the comfort and benefit of those who receive it.* But there is no colour for this, if the thing be rightly consider'd: Because the comfort and benefit of the Sacrament depends upon the blessing annexed to the Institution. And as *Water* in *Baptism*, without any substantial change made in that Element, may by the Divine blessing accompanying the Institution be effectual to the washing away of Sin, and Spiritual Regeneration; So there can no reason in the world be given why the Elements of *Bread* and *Wine* in the *Lord's Supper* may not by the same Divine blessing accompanying this Institution, make the worthy receivers partakers of all the Spiritual comfort and benefit designed to us thereby, without any substantial change made in those Elements, since our Lord hath told us, that *verily the flesh profiteth nothing.* So that if we could doe so odd and strange a thing as to eat the very natural flesh, and drink the bloud of our Lord, I do not see of what greater advantage it would be to us than what we may have by partaking of the Symbols of his body and bloud as he hath appointed *in remembrance of him.* For the Spiritual efficacy of the Sacrament doth not depend upon the nature of the thing received, supposing we receive what our Lord appointed, and receive it with a right preparation and disposition of mind, but upon the supernatural blessing that goes along with it, and makes it effectual to those Spiritual ends for which it was appointed.

The *Fifth* and last pretended ground of this Doctrine is, *to magnify the power of the Priest in being able to work so great a Miracle.* And this with great pride and pomp is often urg'd by them as a transcendent instance of the Divine Wisedom, to find out so admirable a way to raise the power and reverence of the Priest; that he should be able every day, and as often as he pleases, by repeating a few words to work

so

ſo miraculous a change, and (as they love moſt abſurdly and blaſphemouſly to ſpeak) *to make God himſelf.*

But this is to pretend to a power above that of God himſelf, for he did not, nor cannot make himſelf, nor doe any thing that implies a contradiction, as *Tranſubſtantiation* evidently does in their pretending *to make God.* For to make that which already is, and to make that *now* which *always* was, is not onely vain and trifling if it could be done, but impoſſible becauſe it implies a contradiction.

And what if after all *Tranſubſtantiation*, if it were poſſible and actually wrought by the Prieſt, would yet be no Miracle? For there are two things neceſſary to a Miracle, that there be a ſupernatural effect wrought, and that this effect be evident to ſenſe. So that though a ſupernatural effect be wrought, yet if it be not evident to ſenſe, it is to all the ends and purpoſes of a Miracle as if it were not; and can be no teſtimony or proof of any thing, becauſe it ſelf ſtands in need of another Miracle to give teſtimony to it, and to prove that it was wrought. And neither in Scripture, nor in profane Authours, nor in common uſe of ſpeech, is any thing call'd a Miracle, but what falls under the notice of our Senſes: A *Miracle* being nothing elſe but *a ſupernatural effect evident to ſenſe*, the great end and deſign whereof is to be a ſenſible proof and conviction to us of ſomething that we do not ſee.

And for want of this Condition, *Tranſubſtantiation*, if it were true, would be no Miracle. It would indeed be very *ſupernatural*, but for all that it would not be a *Sign* or *Miracle*: For a Sign or Miracle is always a thing ſenſible, otherwiſe it could be no Sign. Now that ſuch a change as is pretended in *Tranſubſtantiation* ſhould really be wrought, and yet there ſhould be no ſign and appearance of it, is a thing very wonderfull, but not to ſenſe; for our ſenſes perceive no change, the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament to all our ſenſes remaining juſt as they were before: And that a thing ſhould remain to all appearance

pearance juſt as it was, hath nothing at all of wonder in it: we wonder indeed when we ſee a ſtrange thing done, but no man wonders when he ſees nothing done. So that *Tranſubſtantiation*, if they will needs have it a Miracle, is ſuch a Miracle as any man may work that hath but the confidence to face men down that he works it, and the fortune to be believed; And though the Church of *Rome* may magnify their Prieſts upon account of this Miracle, which they ſay they can work every day and every hour, yet I cannot underſtand the reaſon of it; for when this great work (as they call it) is done, there is nothing more appears to be done than if there were no Miracle: Now ſuch a Miracle as to all appearance is no Miracle, I ſee no reaſon why a Proteſtant Miniſter, as well as a Popiſh Prieſt, may not work as often as he pleaſes; or if he can but have the patience to let it alone, it will work it ſelf. For ſurely nothing in the World is eaſier than to let a thing be as it is, and by ſpeaking a few words over it to make it juſt what it was before. Every man, every day, may work ten thouſand ſuch Miracles.

And thus I have diſpatch'd the *Firſt* Part of my Diſcourſe, which was to conſider the pretended Grounds and *Reaſons* of the Church of *Rome* for this Doctrine, and to ſhew the weakneſs and inſufficiency of them. I come in the

II. SECOND place, to produce our *Objections* againſt it. Which will be of ſo much the greater force, becauſe I have already ſhewn this Doctrine to be deſtitute of all Divine warrant and authority, and of any other ſort of Ground ſufficient in reaſon to juſtify it. So that I do not now object againſt a Doctrine which hath a fair probability of Divine Revelation on its ſide, for that would weigh down all objections which did not plainly overthrow the probability and credit of its Divine Revelation: But I object againſt a Doctrine by the mere will and tyranny of men impos'd upon the belief of Chriſtians, without

without *any* evidence of *Scripture*, and againſt *all* the evidence of *Reaſon* and *Senſe*.

The Objections I ſhall reduce to theſe *two* Heads. *Firſt*, the infinite ſcandal of this Doctrine to the Chriſtian Religion. And *Secondly*, the monſtrous and inſupportable abſurdity of it.

Firſt, *The infinite ſcandal of this Doctrine to the Chriſtian Religion.* And that upon theſe *four* accounts. 1. Of the ſtupidity of this Doctrine. 2. The real barbarouſneſs of this Sacrament and Rite of our Religion upon ſuppoſition of the truth of this Doctrine. 3. Of the cruel and bloudy conſequences of it. 4. Of the danger of Idolatry; which they are certainly guilty of, if this Doctrine be not true.

1. Upon account of *the ſtupidity of this Doctrine.* I remember that *Tully*, who was a man of very good ſenſe, inſtanceth in the conceit of *eating God* as the extremity of madneſs, and ſo ſtupid an apprehenſion as he thought no man was ever guilty of. * *When we call*, ſays he, *the fruits of the earth* Ceres, *and wine* Bacchus, *we uſe but the common language; but do you think any man ſo mad as to believe that which he eats to be God?* It ſeems he could not believe that ſo extravagant a folly had ever entred into the mind of man. It is a very ſevere ſaying of *Averroes* the *Arabian* Philoſopher (who lived after this Doctrine was entertained among *Chriſtians*) and ought to make the Church of *Rome* bluſh, if ſhe can; * *I have travell'd*, ſays he, *over the world, and have found divers* Sects; *but ſo ſottiſh a* Sect *or Law I never found, as is the* Sect *of the* Chriſtians; *becauſe with their own teeth they devour their God whom they worſhip.* It was great ſtupidity in the People of *Iſrael* to ſay, *come let us make us Gods*; but it was civilly ſaid of them, *Let us make us Gods that may go before us*, in compariſon of the Church of *Rome*, who ſay, *Let us make a God that we may eat him.* So that upon the whole matter I cannot but wonder that they ſhould chuſe thus to expoſe Faith to the contempt of all that are endued with Reaſon. And to ſpeak the plain truth, the Chriſtian Religion was never ſo horribly expoſed to the ſcorn of Atheiſts and Infidels,

* *De Nat. Deorum, l.* 3.

* Dionyſ. Carthuſ. *in* 4. *diſt.* 10. *art.* 1.

as

as it hath been by this moſt abſurd and ſenſeleſs Doctrine. But thus it was foretold that † *the Man of Sin* ſhould come *with power and Signs and Lying Miracles, and with all deceivableneſs of unrighteouſneſs*, with all the *Legerdemain* and *jugling* tricks of falſhood and impoſture; amongſt which this of *Tranſubſtantiation*, which they call a *Miracle*, and we a *Cheat*, is one of the chief: And in all probability thoſe common *jugling* words of *hocus pocus* are nothing elſe but a corruption of *hoc eſt corpus*, by way of ridiculous imitation of the Prieſts of the Church of *Rome* in their *trick* of *Tranſubſtantiation*. Into ſuch contempt by this fooliſh Doctrine and pretended Miracle of theirs have they brought the moſt ſacred and venerable Myſtery of our Religion.

† 2 Theſſ. 2. 10.

2. It is very ſcandalous likewiſe upon account of the real *barbarouſneſs* of this Sacrament and Rite of our Religion, upon ſuppoſition of the truth of this Doctrine. Literally to *eat the fleſh of the Son of man, and to drink his bloud*, St. *Auſtin*, as I have ſhewed before, declares to be a great *Impiety*. And the impiety and barbarouſneſs of the thing is not in truth extenuated, but onely the appearance of it, by its being done under the *Species of Bread and Wine*: For the thing they acknowledge is really done, and they believe that they verily eat and drink the natural fleſh and bloud of *Chriſt*. And what can any man doe more unworthily towards his Friend? How can he poſſibly uſe him more barbarouſly, than to feaſt upon his living fleſh and bloud? It is one of the greateſt wonders in the world, that it ſhould ever enter into the minds of men to put upon our Saviour's words, ſo eaſily capable of a more convenient ſenſe, and ſo neceſſarily requiring it, a meaning ſo plainly contrary to Reaſon, and Senſe, and even to Humanity it ſelf. Had the ancient Chriſtians owned any ſuch Doctrine, we ſhould have heard of it from the Adverſaries of our Religion in every page of their Writings; and they would have deſired no greater advantage againſt the Chriſtians than to have been able to hit them in the teeth with their feaſting upon the

the natural fleſh and bloud of their Lord, and their God, and their beſt Friend. What endleſs triumphs would they have made upon this Subject? And with what confidence would they have ſet the cruelty uſed by Chriſtians in their *Sacrament*, againſt their God *Saturn*'s eating his own Children, and all the cruel and bloudy Rites of their Idolatry? But that no ſuch thing was then objected by the *Heathens* to the *Chriſtians*, is to a wiſe man inſtead of a thouſand Demonſtrations that no ſuch Doctrine was then believed.

3. It is ſcandalous alſo upon account of the *cruel and bloudy conſequences* of this Doctrine; ſo contrary to the plain Laws of Chriſtianity, and to one great end and deſign of this Sacrament, which is to unite Chriſtians in the moſt perfect love and charity to one another: Whereas this Doctrine hath been the occaſion of the moſt barbarous and bloudy Tragedies that ever were acted in the World. For this hath been in the Church of *Rome* the great *burning Article*; and as abſurd and unreaſonable as it is, more Chriſtians have been murther'd for the denial of it than perhaps for all the other Articles of their Religion. And I think it may generally paſs for a true obſervation that all Sects are commonly moſt hot and furious for thoſe things for which there is leaſt reaſon; for what men want of Reaſon for their Opinions, they uſually ſupply and make up in Rage. And it was no more than needed to uſe this ſeverity upon this occaſion; for nothing but the cruel fear of death could in probability have driven ſo great a part of mankind into the acknowledgment of ſo unreaſonable and ſenſeleſs a Doctrine.

O bleſſed Saviour! thou beſt Friend and greateſt lover of mankind, who can imagine thou didſt ever intend that men ſhould kill one another for not being able to believe contrary to their ſenſes; for being unwilling to think, that thou ſhouldſt make one of the moſt horrid and barbarous things that can be imagin'd a main Duty and principal Myſtery of thy Religion; for not flattering the pride and preſump-

tion of the Prieſt who ſays he can make God, and for not complying with the folly and ſtupidity of the People who believe that they can eat him?

4. Upon account of the danger of *Idolatry*; which they are certainly guilty of if this Doctrine be not true, and ſuch a change as they pretend be not made in the Sacrament; for if it be not, then they worſhip a Creature inſtead of the Creatour God bleſſed for ever. But ſuch a change I have ſhewn to be impoſſible; or if it could be, yet they can never be certain that it is, and conſequently are always in danger of Idolatry: And that they can never be certain that ſuch a change is made, is evident; becauſe, according to the expreſs determination of the Council of *Trent*, that depends upon the mind and *intention of the Prieſt*, which cannot certainly be known but by Revelation, which is not pretended in this caſe. And if they be miſtaken about this change, through the knavery or croſneſs of the Prieſt who will not *make God* but when he thinks fit, they muſt not think to excuſe themſelves from Idolatry becauſe they intended to worſhip God and not a Creature; for ſo the *Perſians* might be excus'd from Idolatry in worſhipping the *Sun*, becauſe they intend to worſhip God and not a Creature; and ſo indeed we may excuſe all the Idolatry that ever was in the world, which is nothing elſe but a miſtake of the Deity, and upon that miſtake a worſhipping of ſomething as God which is not God.

Secondly, Beſides the infinite ſcandal of this Doctrine upon the accounts I have mentioned, *the monſtrous abſurdities* of it make it inſupportable to any Religion. I am very well aſſured of the grounds of Religion in general, and of the Chriſtian Religion in particular; and yet I cannot ſee that the foundations of any revealed Religion are ſtrong enough to bear the weight of ſo many and ſo great abſurdities as this Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* would load it withall. And to make this evident, I ſhall not inſiſt upon thoſe groſs contradictions of the ſame Body being in ſo many ſeveral places at once; of

our

our Saviour's giving away himſelf with his own hands to every one of his Diſciples, and yet ſtill keeping himſelf to himſelf; and a thouſand more of the like nature: But to ſhew the abſurdity of this Doctrine I ſhall onely ask theſe few Queſtions.

1. Whether any man have, or ever had greater evidence of the truth of any Divine Revelation than every man hath of the falſhood of *Tranſubſtantiation*? Infidelity were hardly poſſible to men, if all men had the ſame evidence for the Chriſtian Religion which they have againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*, that is, the clear and irreſiſtible evidence of ſenſe. He that can once be brought to contradict or deny his Senſes, is at an end of certainty; for what can a man be certain of, if he be not certain of what he ſees? In ſome circumſtances our Senſes may deceive us, but no Faculty deceives us ſo little and ſo ſeldom: And when our Senſes do deceive us, even that errour is not to be corrected without the help of our Senſes.

2. Suppoſing this Doctrine had been delivered in Scripture in the very ſame words that it is decreed in the Council of *Trent*, by what clearer evidence or ſtronger Argument could any man prove to me that ſuch words were in the Bible, than I can prove to him that bread and wine after conſecration are bread and wine ſtill? He could but appeal to my eyes to prove ſuch words to be in the Bible, and with the ſame reaſon and juſtice might I appeal to ſeveral of his ſenſes to prove to him that the bread and wine after conſecration are bread and wine ſtill.

3. Whether it be reaſonable to imagine that God ſhould make that a part of the Chriſtian Religion which ſhakes the main external evidence and confirmation of the whole? I mean the Miracles which were wrought by our Saviour and his Apoſtles, the aſſurance whereof did at firſt depend upon the certainty of ſenſe. For if the ſenſes of thoſe who ſay they ſaw them were deceived then there might be no Miracles wrought; and conſequently it may

juſtly be doubted whether that kind of confirmation which God hath given to the Chriſtian Religion would be ſtrong enough to prove it, ſuppoſing *Tranſubſtantiation* to be a part of it: Becauſe every man hath as great evidence that *Tranſubſtantiation* is falſe, as he hath that the Chriſtian Religion is true. Suppoſe then *Tranſubſtantiation* to be part of the Chriſtian Doctrine, it muſt have the ſame confirmation with the whole, and that is Miracles: But of all Doctrines in the world it is peculiarly incapable of being proved by a Miracle. For if a Miracle were wrought for the proof of it, the very ſame aſſurance which any man hath of the truth of the Miracle he hath of the falſhood of the Doctrine, that is, the clear evidence of his Senſes. For that there is a Miracle wrought to prove *that what he ſees in the Sacrament is not bread but the body of Chriſt*, there is onely the evidence of ſenſe; and there is the very ſame evidence to prove *that what he ſees in the Sacrament is not the body of Chriſt but bread.* So that here would ariſe a new Controverſie, whether a man ſhould rather believe his Senſes giving teſtimony againſt the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, or bearing witneſs to a Miracle wrought to confirm that Doctrine; there being the very ſame evidence againſt the truth of the Doctrine, which there is for the truth of the Miracle: And then the Argument for *Tranſubſtantiation* and the Objection againſt it would juſt balance one another; and conſequently *Tranſubſtantiation* is not to be proved by a Miracle, becauſe that would be, *to prove to a man by ſome thing that he ſees, that he doth not ſee what he ſees.* And if there were no other evidence that *Tranſubſtantiation* is no part of the Chriſtian Doctrine, this would be ſufficient, that what proves the one doth as much overthrow the other; and that Miracles which are certainly the beſt and higheſt external proof of Chriſtianity are the worſt proof in the world of *Tranſubſtantiation*, unleſs a man can renounce his ſenſes at the ſame time that he relies upon them. For a man cannot believe a Miracle without relying upon ſenſe, nor *Tranſubſtantiation* without renoun-

renouncing it. So that never were any two things ſo ill coupled together as the Doctrine of Chriſtianity and that of *Tranſubſtantiation*, becauſe they draw ſeveral ways, and are ready to ſtrangle one another; becauſe the main evidence of the Chriſtian Doctrine, which is Miracles, is reſolved into the certainty of ſenſe, but this evidence is clear and point-blank againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*.

4. And *Laſtly*, I would ask what we are to think of the Argument which our Saviour uſed to convince his Diſciples after his Reſurrection that his Body was really riſen, and that they were not deluded by a Ghoſt or Apparition? Is it a neceſſary and concluſive Argument or not? * *And he ſaid unto them, why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts ariſe in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I my ſelf; for a Spirit hath not fleſh and bones, as ye ſee me have.* But now if we ſuppoſe with the Church of *Rome* the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* to be true, and that he had inſtructed his Diſciples in it juſt before his death, ſtrange thoughts might juſtly have riſen in their hearts, and they might have ſaid to him; Lord, it is but a few days ago ſince thou didſt teach us not to believe our ſenſes, but directly contrary to what we ſaw, *viz.* that the bread which thou gaveſt us in the Sacrament, though we ſaw it and handled it and taſted it to be bread, yet was not bread, but thine own natural body; and now thou appealeſt to our ſenſes to prove that this is thy body which we now ſee. If ſeeing and handling be an unqueſtionable evidence that things are what they appear to our ſenſes, then we were deceived before in the Sacrament; and if they be not, then we are not ſure now that this is thy body which we now ſee and handle, but it may be perhaps bread under the appearance of fleſh and bones, juſt as in the Sacrament, that which we ſaw and handled and taſted to be bread was thy fleſh and bones under the form and appearance of bread. Now upon this ſuppoſition, it would have been a hard matter to have quieted the thoughts of the Diſciples: For if the

* Luke 24. 38, 39.

Argu-

Argument which our Saviour uſed did certainly prove to them that what they ſaw and handled was his body, his very natural fleſh and bones, becauſe they ſaw and handled them, (which it were impious to deny) it would as ſtrongly prove that what they ſaw and received before in the Sacrament was not the natural body and bloud of *Chriſt*, but real bread and wine: And conſequently, that according to our Saviour's arguing after his Reſurrection they had no reaſon to believe *Tranſubſtantiation* before. For that very Argument by which our Saviour proves the reality of his body after his Reſurrection doth as ſtrongly prove the reality of bread and wine after Conſecration. But our Saviour's Argument was moſt infallibly good and true, and therefore the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* is undoubtedly falſe.

Upon the whole matter I ſhall onely ſay this, that ſome other Points between us and the Church of *Rome* are managed with ſome kind of wit and ſubtilty, but this of *Tranſubſtantiation* is carried out by mere dint of impudence and facing down of Mankind.

And of this the more diſcerning perſons of that Church are of late grown ſo ſenſible that they would now be glad to be rid of this odious and ridiculous Doctrine. But the Council of *Trent* hath faſten'd it to their Religion, and made it a neceſſary and eſſential Point of their Belief, and they cannot now part with it if they would; it is like a Mill-ſtone hung about the neck of Popery which will ſink it at the laſt.

And though ſome of their greateſt Wits, as Cardinal *Perron*, and of late Monſieur *Arnauld*, have undertaken the defence of it in great Volumes; yet it is an abſurdity of that monſtrous and maſſy weight, that no humane authority or wit are able to ſupport it: It will make the very Pillars of St. *Peter*'s crack, and requires more Volumes to make it good than would fill the *Vatican*.

And

And now I would apply my ſelf to the poor deluded People of that Church, if they were either permitted by their Prieſts, or durſt venture without their leave to look into their Religion and to examine the Doctrines of it. *Conſider, and ſhew your ſelves men.* Do not ſuffer your ſelves any longer to be led blindfold, and by an implicit Faith in your Prieſts, into the belief of nonſenſe and contradiction. Think it enough and too much to let them rook you of your money for pretended Pardons and counterfeit Reliques, but let not the Authority of any Prieſt or Church perſuade you out of your Senſes. Credulity is certainly a fault as well as Infidelity: and he who ſaid, bleſſed are they *that have not ſeen, and yet have believed*, hath no-where ſaid, *bleſſed are they that have ſeen, and yet have not believed*; much leſs, *bleſſed are they that believe directly contrary to what they ſee.*

To conclude this Diſcourſe. By what hath been ſaid upon this Argument it will appear, with how little truth, and reaſon, and regard to the intereſt of our common Chriſtianity, it is ſo often ſaid by our Adverſaries, that there are as good arguments for the belief of *Tranſubſtantiation* as of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*: When they themſelves do acknowledge with us that the Doctrine of the *Trinity* is grounded upon the Scriptures, and that according to the interpretation of them by the conſent of the ancient Fathers: But their Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* I have plainly ſhewn to have no ſuch ground, and that this is acknowledged by very many learned men of their own Church. And this Doctrine of theirs being firſt plainly proved by us to be deſtitute of all Divine Warrant and Authority, our Objections againſt it from the manifold contradictions of it to Reaſon and Senſe are ſo many Demonſtrations of the falſehood of it. Againſt all which they have nothing to put in the oppoſite Scale but the Infallibility of their Church, for which there is even leſs colour of proof from Scripture than for *Tranſubſtantiation* it ſelf. But ſo fond are they of their own Innovations and Errours, that rather than the Dictates of their Church, how groundleſs

leſs and abſurd ſoever, ſhould be call'd in queſtion; rather than not have their will of us in impoſing upon us what they pleaſe, they will overthrow any Article of the Chriſtian Faith, and ſhake the very foundations of our common Religion: A clear evidence that the Church of *Rome* is not the true Mother, ſince ſhe can be ſo well contented that Chriſtianity ſhould be deſtroyed rather than the Point in queſtion ſhould be decided againſt her.

THE END.

Advertiſements.

THERE is lately publiſhed a *Diſcourſe of the Communion in one kind*, In anſwer to a Treatiſe of the Biſhop of *Meaux*'s of Communion under both ſpecies. In *Quarto*.

Alſo a View of the whole Controverſie between the Repreſenter and the Anſwerer; with an Anſwer to the Repreſenter's laſt Reply: In which are laid open ſome of the methods by which Proteſtants are Miſrepreſented by Papiſts. In *Quarto*.

Printed for *B. Aylmer* and *W. Rogers*.